

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include Figs. 1-3, which replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-3. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this amendment, the application included claims 1-12. Claims 1, 4, 6-9 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-12 stand pending for examination.

The Examiner indicated that the Oath/Declaration is objected to because it does not identify the mailing address of the inventor. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.63(c) and 1.76, the mailing address for the inventor was included in the Application Data Sheet that was filed with the application on March 17, 2004. The Applicant respectfully requests clarification if the Examiner continues to believe that the Oath/Declaration is defective.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3 and 5-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of the non-patent literature by Feghhi et al. ("Feghhi").

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 4, 6-9 and 11 have been amended to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections. It is believed that the amendments herein overcome the rejections and do not introduce new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because the Office Action does not cite a reference for each and every claim element. Specifically, the Office Action does not cite a reference for "a resource server audit database; and a usage analyzer that analyzes the key server audit database and the resource server audit database to compare events therein," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action states this and

credits the teaching to what is known in the art. The Applicant respectfully requests an affidavit in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) stating exactly what the Examiner believes to be in the prior art so that the Applicant may evaluate the teachings in light of the claim element. In the absence of an affidavit or a citation to a reference, the Applicant maintains that all pending claims are allowable, at least for this reason.

The Applicant also respectfully points out that the Certificate Revocation List (CRL) taught by Fegghi is not the same as a key server audit database. Hence, all pending claims are believed to be allowable, at least for this additional reason.

The Applicant maintains that significant distinctions exist between what is known in the art and what the Applicant claims. In order to advance prosecution, however, the Applicant respectfully requests a citation to each element of every claim, or an affidavit specifically stating what the Examiner believes to exist in the prior art, so that the Applicant may address the substance of the rejections. In the absence of an express showing of documentary proof, the Applicant maintains that all pending claims include subject matter not taught or suggested by the cited reference nor found in the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 17, 2007

/Irvin E. Branch/

Irvin E. Branch

Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
61199830 v1